

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/477,034	12/31/1999	LANCE W. DOVER	042390.P6115	8629
75	590 12/0 4 /2003		EXAMI	NER
MATTHEW C FAGAN			SURYAWANSHI, SURESH	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SEVENTH FLO	OOR		2185	ha
LOS ANGELES, CA 900251026			DATE MAILED: 12/04/2003	13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/477,034	DOVER ET AL.	∞
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Suresh K Suryawanshi	2185	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 17 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appear Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applion a timely filed amendment white all (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	oly to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions.	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S I36(a) and the appropriate	See MPEP
AT CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	statutory period for reply originally set in	the final Office action; or	(2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR			
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) \square they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NO	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly
 For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we 	• • •		and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:		Dennis M. B Dennis M. B Primary Exa	utler

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that the claimed monotonic counter is different than an electronic odometer acting as a monotonic counter because the claimed monotonic counter is used for synchronizing software threads and the claimed monotonic counters are used in computer systems. But none of the claims presented for consideration has such limitations as argued by the applicants.